Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VII, No. 17, *Issue Number* 326, APRIL 26, 1950 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED MAY 3

WORKABLE INDIVIDUALISM

by Lewis O. Anderson

Opponents of collectivism waste a lot of time by merely denouncing "big government". They should plump for "unofficial government", the true expression of individualism -- which means "divided responsibility" -- not irresponsibility -- and which signifies not "selfishness" but true co-operation. Opponents of collectivism are losing the battle of ideas, partly because they are losing the battle of words.

Collectivism is gracefully winning the psychological war against individualism by painless subversion of the meaning of words. Ironically, the subversion is carried out mainly by the dupes themselves. They find it more attractive to wrap themselves up in the collectivist cloak of "co-operation" than to tax their own brains. They escape the rugged discipline of individualism by surrendering to the notion that it is identified with selfishness, which seems a plausible excuse for dismissing individualism.

For a hundred years the enemy has been kindly stating in unmistakable terms the fundamental issue: collectivism versus individualism. The Communist Manifesto, in specifying the middle class individual, decrees: "This person must indeed be swept out of the way, and made impossible." This refers to sound individualism, not to abuses; for the middle class has always been the stronghold of sound individualism.

The enemy is further kind enough not to wound your feelings; you are comforted with the doctrine of inevitability of the demise of individuality as part of the process of industrialization. Centralization and a corresponding reduction of individuality are declared to be inescapable, no matter if lamentable or otherwise. The enemy has definite convictions; while would-be individualists dare not have convictions, for fear of offending somebody.

II

On the surface, the issue appears to be centralized responsibility versus divided individual responsibility. This is false, as it ignores the perpetual lust for power. After a person's sense of brotherhood is evaporated, the centralized residue is not responsibility but corrupt irresponsibility. This may not be manifest at first, but sooner or later the one with the greatest lust for power will push to the top.

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The evil results of political autocracy are essentially the evils of private economic centralization, carried out on a far more comprehensive scale. To prevent official government from overstepping its delegated power, unofficial government must put its own house in order, notably in the spheres of business ethics and education. Unofficial government must recognize that everyone in business has an educational obligation to develop ethical standards in its management; otherwise there will be no one to curb lust for power.

The mere fact of the decline of individual dignity during industrial ascendancy is no proof that the said decline is inevitable. Nor is the plain observation that not every individual can be the head of an industrial enterprise a refutation of the philosophy of individualism. Many naturally have jumped to the false conclusion that there is no longer any room for individualism as a philosophy of social relations in industry because every person cannot be the head of a business.

Also there is the common failure to distinguish between use and abuse of individualism. This enables Communists and anti-Communists to rant in unison against abuses as if they constituted the true meaning of individualism; they rant without end on the theme that "individualism in economics led inevitably to selfish aggrandizement". They never tire of shouting that individualism is essentially selfish.

They never use their heads and ask the question: How can selfishness be eradicated, or even reduced, by the mere device of concentrating all power in one individual?

For collectivism is revealed to be but a smoke screen for individualism in the worst sense attributed to that word. It is the embodiment of all the abuses. It is selfishness in its worst degree. Soviet Russia as a country, and Stalin as its ruler constitute a living illustration of this truth.

As a contrast, let us look at our traditional system. The very fruition of the free enterprise system of private property in general demonstrated not so often selfishness but primarily the sharpening of a personal interest in promoting the welfare of one's neighbors -- true "co-operation". The institution of private property is unsurpassed economically in putting responsibility squarely on the shoulders of every individual.

That is a lesson often forgotten in modern industry. Many forgot to give each employee something to be responsible for, in the sense of contributing to the welfare of the company as a whole. It is the divi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion of responsibility that puts individualism in a definite positive and constructive role in industry.

There is another lesson. Many failed to impress upon wage earners the underlying common denominator of profit and wages, leaving them to absorb the Marxist false doctrine that there is an essential antagonism between the two.

As a matter of fact, the very term "profit-sharing", as sometimes used, suggests a hidden sense of guilt. Thus used it does not eradicate false doctrine but rather often sharpens the artificial antagonism. It implies that wages are not profit-sharing; it implies sharing with the "workers" some of the "unearned income", which is a false notion that cannot foster divided individual responsibility.

III

The erosion of individualism means erosion of a moral order. Morality is an individual matter; there is no collective salvation, material or otherwise. The inherent immorality of mob action and mob thinking is too well recorded to need comment; and it is the predominant type of mental escapade which is annihilating the distinction between right and wrong. Crowd-mindedness is perverting the true meaning of reform; social reform is a favorite cloak for collectivism.

The erosion of ethics is further demonstrated by those who urge that big business should not be criticized on ethical grounds but only on grounds of bigness. Some spout, in effect, that big business is black because it is big; others that big business is white because it is big. Monopoly appears white if you are in control, black if the other fellow is in control.

Both sides disregard the question of justice in management and make their verdict solely on the basis of materialistic efficiency. It is a ridiculous attempt to reduce the problem of lust for power to a mere matter of technology. It clears the field for autocracy.

As an ethical problem, lust for power cannot be curbed by technology. It cannot be remedied by centralization in industry; it can be held in check only under division of responsibility.

IV

The individualist is losing the psychological war largely by default. The remedy for too much gang psychology is not more of the same stuff. Only a positive substitute can turn the tide. It must be a substitute idea, not a new tune for the same goose step.

The individualist has been defaulting by permitting the word "cooperation" to be captured by the enemy, and used as an antonym for indi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vidualism. The bottle of undiluted Communist poison is being sold freely and widely by merely labelling it the "co-operative system", and by falsely contrasting it with the private profit system.

Robots don't co-operate. Neither do slaves. Neither do their masters. Co-operation and individualism are inseparable; neither one makes sense without the other in actual social reform. Altruism and individualism are inseparable in genuine social reform. It takes two to make a bargain. It likewise takes two or more to make standards of social management mean something, and to make improvements on the standards.

Dupes of Marxism argue that individualism is outmoded by far-flung economic interdependence. But the interdependence is precisely what makes sound individualism more imperative than ever. For only individualists can figure out how to make the interdependence mutually profitable. Robots can't. Political and Economic Royalists won't, except for their own purpose. By recapturing the word "co-operation", individualists could put their enemies in a precarious spot.

A philosophy of government does not sprout automatically from the "grass roots", the present trademark of most political toys. It can come only from intellectuals ready to demonstrate that the most important digestive system in the human body is not the one below the ribs but the one above the ears.

The multitudes are molded by individualists, by intellectuals, not vice versa, as now pretended. At present the standard procedure is to flatter and appease the common folk, and if they don't respond to the tickling feather, to pester them with the charge that they are apathetic and indifferent to the vital issues of the day -- when only trivial questions are put before them. It is the slumbering intellectuals who need prodding to delineate a faith worth following.

The failure of intellectuals in favored climes to create or resurrect an audible faith -- a philosophy of truly liberal government -- is now threatening to plunge all mankind into autocracy and tyranny. In such a liberal philosophy must be one indispensable principle: individualism, manifest as divided responsibility, with its material expression, unofficial government.

Lewis O. Anderson, of Osakis, Minnesota, is a former professor of psychology who wrote "Our Political Devaluation", HUMAN EVENTS, January 4.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to Human Events. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to Human Events, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 17

UNIVERSITY OF M... RECEIVED MAY 1950 LIBRARY

By Frank C. Hanighen April 26, 1950

OIL AND PROPAGANDA: Our correspondent on Capitol Hill, Edna Lonigan, writes on the issue of the tidelands oil bill which has been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee: The measure confirms the states' title to lands beneath their coastal waters, and to oil and other resources in the submerged lands, but it also gives the Federal Government a share in the revenues of such lands. It is therefore a compromise on the major issue of protecting our Federal system.

The history of the tug-of-war between those who want greater power for the central government and those who want to keep a Federal Republic, was described in HUMAN EVENTS by Frank Chodorov in November, 1948. As he said then, both law and acquiescence had apparently given clear title to the states, and even Secretary Ickes, no shrinking violet, originally refused to issue Federal leases for submerged oil lands. But with the growth of the central power, the issue was taken to the Supreme Court, and it ruled that "California is not the owner of the three-mile marginal belt along its coast", and that the Federal Government had "paramount rights". This loose phrase, as Mr. Chodorov said, "insinuates a superseding interest of the Federal Government, and can be invoked, whenever the occasion arises, to the point of reducing the states to parish status".

Congress passed a bill restoring title to the states but it was vetoed by President Truman. The new bill, while in form a victory for the Federal principle, actually is a victory for centralization. Revenue is power, and division of revenue between the central and the state governments strengthens the central power.

The New York Times on April 23 stated the case for centralization. The issue, it said, is whether "financial interests of a few individual states . . . collide . . . with the greater interests of the nation". The position taken by the Times assumes that in a Republic of sovereign states the national interest is weakened. The appeal to Congress to redefine the disputed rights is "political" (faintly odious). The "proper way" to decide the issue is by the Supreme Court (that is, we should have tamely acquiesced in the Dred Scott decision). It is important, the Times continues, that "the national interest prevail" (that is, the interest of the centralizers).

By picturing the new bill as a concession to the states, the Administration may get a firm hold on state submarginal lands, and a bridgehead from which to add to its share. Why cannot advocates of state sovereignty show clearly that a Federal Republic is not a collection of weak local authorities? A Federal Republic is, on the contrary, not only a higher ideal, but also a stronger form of the national interest.

* * * * *

SAND IN OUR EYES: The Senate has been bogged down in long debates over DP's and reclamation projects, but the deep anxiety over foreign relations has erupted again and again. Senator Jenner warned that we lost China while our attention was carefully diverted to the Marshall Plan, the Truman doctrine, (and the Airlift). Now our attention is being assiduously focused on Hainan (and Point Four) while the same humiliating defeat is being prepared for us in Europe. "Every hour produces additional proof", he said, "of how Secretary Acheson is continuing to double talk us ever deeper into Communist booby traps all over the world. . . . Are the Amer-

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican people to be forced to wait until it is too late, before they learn that the collapse of Asia has become a cover up for their sell-out in Europe?" The danger spot is Germany but France is almost as vulnerable.

The shocking facts about our German policy have been fully reported in HUMAN EVENTS, but the deadly parallel between the early stages of the China conquest and the present plight of Europe has not been realized by our people. The conquest of China was brought about by a cross-play between pro-Communist sympathizers in our Government and Communist influences in the molding of public opinion. The same guiding minds are using their apparatus to distract us once again. We know the Communist agents in the Treasury sired the Morgenthau Plan, so Americans would not see how well it was designed for its military purpose. We suspect their influence in the farce of de-Nazification, in the Nuremberg trials without the benefit of law, and in the bloody executions in which we were given the starring role, and so forth.

While the Russian General Staff manipulates its puppets with superb skill and timing, the thinking for our very survival rests on the shaky base of the bipartisan policy. The President added two Republicans of his own choosing to his official family, but Senator Jenner said, "The bipartisan foreign policy . . . is a gigantic fraud. . . . The President needs a bipartisan foreign policy not to defeat the Communists but to keep the Republicans quiet" -- quiet, that is, about American security.

The pressures below the surface are slowly forcing a rift between the Republicans who have succumbed to the siren's song, and those who, like Ulysses, can close their ears, so they will not be led to their destruction. The next few weeks, with debate on foreign policy in the Senate, and on the budget in the House, promise to be momentous days on Capitol Hill.

* * * * *

CORRECTION: We wish to rectify a mistake in last week's column, in the item entitled "Action in Attica". We inadvertently, but not unpardonably, confused the present Administrator of ECA in Greece with the former head of the American Economic Mission to Greece. Mr. Paul R. Porter is now ECA Administrator in that country; Mr. Paul A. Porter (formerly of the OPA) served as head of the American Economic Mission in the year 1946, and is now in private life. Our apologies to our readers and to the Messrs. Porter.

* * * * *

THE BIG WIND: All Executive bureaus are generous with press releases but none are more prodigal than Oscar Ewing's Federal Security Agency, a huge bay tree of an agency which shelters the Food and Drug Administration, the Social Security Administration, the Public Health Service and many other bureaus. No release may be issued by these bureaus without having the lead paragraph contain a statement by Oscar himself. Taken one by one, these mimeograph handouts seem to resemble the familiar Government article. But when examined in sequence the effect is devastating: Oscar emerges as the Great Know-All, the National Poo Bah, the Universal Mr. Fix It. Here are some sample leads from releases of recent weeks:

Feb. 16: "The average length of life in the United States has increased to 67.2 years, according to . . . Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator." March 2: ". . . Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing declared that 'Sick children are all too frequently forced to give up all school-like experiences during the period they are in hospitals.'" March 10: "'What do I have to do to be a baseball coach when I grow up?' If your son or a pupil asks this question, you can answer after reading a publication just released. . . . Administrator Oscar Ewing in releasing the report expressed confidence . . ." March 29:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing today issued a warning to shoe stores, their customers and their employees that X-ray machines used for fitting shoes may be dangerous."

April 2: (This is one that ought to make the State Department sit up and take notice.) "'People everywhere can look to international teamwork for real progress in improving human health and welfare', Oscar R. Ewing said today. 'When I was in Europe recently, nothing impressed me more than the increased emphasis on co-operation among many nations in attacking these common problems, Mr. Ewing said." April 20: (This one dealt with radioactivity.) "In making the announcement, Mr. Ewing pointed out that education is needed in precautionary measures to be taken in the disposal of radioactive wastes, in the use of high-energy X-ray machines, and in the marketing of materials containing radium or polonium, such as luminous marking tapes." The ludicrous effect of these releases is redoubled when it is recalled that Oscar almost never appears as a witness before a Congressional committee. This is strange, for his Agency is one of the most feverish manufacturers of legislation in the government. Suspicion has long since hardened to conviction that the reason for Oscar's absence is a sublime ignorance of the matter in hand and the terror of his subordinates lest he ruin their dearest hopes and ambitions by opening his mouth before a hostile or malicious legislator.

* * * * *

ABOUT BOOKS: An eminent man of law who showed himself very interested in the current subversive investigation, astonished us the other night when he said he had never read, nor even heard of, Seeds of Treason. This current best-seller, written by Ralph de Toledano and Victor Lasky, and reviewed in HUMAN EVENTS on April 5, serves to illuminate many things about the controversies which today fill the press and set aflame dinner table conversation. But the reviewing clique in New York has given this new book either the "silent" treatment or disparaging reviews -- and consequently it had not come to the notice of our learned friend. This reception recalls that accorded two books by John T. Flynn -- The Roosevelt Myth and The Road Ahead. In the case of the former volume, its publisher Devin-Adair Company had to buy advertising space in which was printed a review of the book by John Chamberlain; and this review had appeared in HUMAN EVENTS. Incidentally, the newspaper in which this extraordinary kind of advertisement appeared was the New York Herald Tribune, which is supposed to be a Republican organ, but had not reviewed the book.

This week, the New York Times Sunday Book Review gave first place, and quite rightly so, to Winston Churchill's Grand Alliance. The reviewer, Mr. Robert E. Sherwood, gives the work unqualified praise. Indeed, all of Mr. Churchill's books have received rather uncritical approval in this country. We note, however, that in Western European countries many of Churchill's facts as well as judgments in these memoirs have been challenged. This brings us to mention a fascinating book, La Fumée d'un Cigare ("Cigar Smoke") by Alfred Fabre-Luce (published by L'Elan, Paris). M. Fabre-Luce is an eminent French journalist who has long been associated with the idea of European Federation. He not only takes issue with Mr. Churchill's memoirs on many points, but also takes a rather bilious view of the British leader's role. M. Fabre-Luce says that future biographers of Churchill will perhaps conclude that "this conservative, this imperialist has finally ended as the gravedigger of capitalism and of the British Empire". We gather that the French writer thinks the fumes of "Winston's" Havana have obscured the grand line of his strategic policy.

These are harsh judgments and may account for the fate of Cigar Smoke in England, if reports we receive from London are true. We hear that the volume of M. Fabre-Luce was seriously considered for publication by a prominent British book publisher. But the latter, after taking legal counsel decided against publication, for fear of a libel suit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

A Hook in Leviathan, by Bradley D. Nash and Cornelius Lynde. New York: The Macmillan Company. $3.00. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

It has been many times remarked that no business corporation could survive a year if it were to adopt the administrative methods and practices of the Government of the United States. It is now a question how much longer the Government itself can survive with them. As the complexity of modern Society increases and the areas of the power of the State are extended, the ineptitude and wastefulness of the present bureaucratic establishment grows more evident and alarming; so that, remembering the analogy of the Roman Republic, and observing the experiences of contemporary nations, we may reasonably wonder whether any vast modern State can be efficiently managed upon any other principle than dictatorship. The conclusion of our authors appears to be that without a radical reorganization of the Executive departments and agencies, Constitutional government in the United States could not outlast another great economic or military crisis.

They are, however, not only convinced that such changes are necessary to the preservation of representative democracy; they are also persuaded that once the necessity is made known the changes will be demanded by the citizens. This, then, is the purpose of their book, a tour de force of condensation and exposition. Into it have been incorporated the principal findings and recommendations of the various majority and minority reports of the Hoover Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, which very few Americans have had the patience or even the opportunity to study. Both Mr. Nash and Mr. Lynde have occupied important administrative posts in various bureaus and agencies and have thus had direct and painful acquaintance with the conflicts, confusions and cross-purposes that have resulted from the vast, sudden and amorphous bureaucratic growths of the last three decades. An anonymous Washington wit has well described the psychological effect of the bureaucratic chaos -- the labyrinthine channels of procedure, the duplications or negations of effort, the mountainous accumulations of paper involved in even the simplest operations -- upon persons who enter the Government service after executive experience in private business. He called it "galloping frustration"; and this malady, although the Messrs. Nash and Lynde do not make the point, seems to be in some way reflected in the rather febrile quality of Washington social life. It is certainly reflected in the astonishing rate of defection and replacement in the Federal service, amounting to something like an annual turnover of 25 per cent, and in the unwillingness of many promising young men to consider the Government service as a career.

Some of the mechanical absurdities of the Federal administration are no doubt inherent in the nature of bureaucracy; some have arisen from the relationship, peculiar to the American system, between Congress and the Executive, which encourages a tendency to organize administrative functions with a view to political expediency rather than to efficiency; but our authors insist that the worst evils can be removed by the reforms that the Commission has proposed. These would involve virtually all executive operations. They have as their main purposes the careful focusing of authority and responsibility at each stage of the executive process between the President and the lower ranks of the departmental staffs, the encouragement of executive initiative, the elimination of conflicting jurisdictions, the softening of the rigid procedures prescribed in the governing statutes, and the abandonment of archaic methods of budgeting, accounting and purchasing. In general the emphasis is upon decentralization and a larger degree of autonomy for the operating divisions, even in such matters as the recruiting of personnel and the procurement of supplies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 17

By Bertrand de Jouvenel PARIS -- April, 1950

WESTERN DEFENSE? NOTHING: Many a time in this correspondence I have dwelt upon the increasing peace of mind of the Europeans under the Marshall Plan. A sense of recovery, of return to normalcy has relieved European anxiety, and induced individuals, feeling solid ground, to form and pursue their private plans. However, this new-found confidence has come from hugging daily reality and abstaining from looking too far to the future. The gloominess which alone prevails in Britain perhaps is due to the fact that only the English, so my wife bluntly says, retain the sense of responsibility of a sovereign nation.

Thus hugging the ground, European opinion remains extremely indifferent to cold war news. Whatever the news, all that matters is that it should remain a cold war. There is the same incredulity about its turning into a real war that was so rudely shattered in May 1940. A slight tremor shook the upper reaches of European opinion after the Privateer disaster. A number of people slowly grasped that the shooting had started: and they glimpsed the possibility that the Soviet mountain might start slipping down upon us.

Such a thought, as soon as conceived, is dismissed as unbearable: for no one believes that some 15 Western divisions could do anything to stop Russian lava. Not only are they far too weak but further they are strung along this long ribbon of shore which constitutes Western Europe so that common defense merely means, with the one exception of England which stands behind, that each national army stands on its strip of shore, giving and receiving no help to and from its neighbor. In order that the national armies should really help each other the lands would have to stand in depth facing Russia: as if Italians fought with Yugoslavs on Yugoslav ground, and French with Germans on German ground. But, as is well known, neither Yugoslavia nor Germany is part of the combined forces.

It would, I think, be well worth while to take a poll of European opinion on Western defense. I think one would find that the people don't want to think about it and, if pressed, do not believe in it.

* * *

CONTROLLED SCHIZOPHRENIA: What of the higher-ups? What of the Western European policy makers? Controlled schizophrenia is good mumbo-jumbo I learned from Dr. Fuchs. If I have rightly understood him, the formula provides a perfect description of top Western European thinking. Our rulers are capable of keeping perfectly separate their thinking about Russia and behavior springing therefrom, and their thinking about Germany and behavior springing therefrom.

When they think about Germany, they are obsessed by the regime under which this nation lived from 1933 onwards and by the evil it wrought in Europe from 1940 to 1945. They are haunted by the will to draw its teeth. For instance, in the French zone alone, 84 thousand tons of ammunition have been destroyed, 16 thousand blockhouses, six thousand kilometers of underground telephones, and 13 underground factories. Fifty thousand ex-officers are under obligation to report weekly. Every precaution is taken to preclude rearmament of Germany, and to break the "officer spirit" (though, come to think of it, the officers were the only ones to try anything against Hitler).

When, on the other hand, our policy makers think about Russia they desperately cast about for means of increasing security from its present level which is precisely nil. Were they suddenly offered a Ruritania standing between Russia and themselves, a land of proven military prowess and under a sympathetic Christian

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democrat government, they would welcome it with open arms into their alliance and association. But this Ruritania is called Western Germany. And that is enough to change our policy-makers' mood from "Come in!" to "Keep down!" This, as everyone indeed knows, stultifies all talk of Western defense.

* * *

THE ARGUMENT ABOUT GERMANY: If you ask a Western European policy maker why Western Germany is to be kept down, you will probably produce an outpouring of emotional arguments: "Have you no memory? Don't you remember what they did in Europe from 1940 to 1945?" The leading feeling you will ascertain is that it would be morally wrong to let Germany return too fast to a normal status. It is then for us a moral duty, as my friend Raymond Aron puts it with brilliant humor, "to lose time".

The idea of returning Germany to a normal status over a period of years proceeds from the wrong-headed identification of a nation with an individual offender. This policy was pursued once after the First World War and worked out very badly. At the outset, under the shock of defeat, those Germans came forward who were most attuned to the Western spirit and they had to bear the full brunt of our severity. I remember as a child seeing the German plenipotientaries shut up at the Hotel des Reservoirs at Versailles: these were our friends in Germany and we burdened them in German eyes with the humiliation they, and not the imperialists, were made to bear. Over the years the treatment of Germany improved while her governments worsened. German warmongers could point to the fact that those Germans most inclined toward the Allies, an Erzberger, a Rathenau, had got the worst deal! Finally our feelings were completely relaxed when Hitler came in, and he, of all people, got the benefit of our having worked off our nerves on Stresemanns and Brünings. This he offered to the German nation as a proof that his high-handed policy was the effective one.

This time we have seen to it ourselves that the best Germans from our point of view should be in the saddle. Is it reasonable to humiliate precisely the men of our choice and to identify in the popular mind their tenure of office with the maximum unequality of treatment, so that, again, others coming after them and far less our friends will get a better deal? This procedure is obviously absurd. How much wiser the behavior of the Allies in 1814. They saw that if they installed in France a government sympathetic to their view of European order, they would give it a deep and firm foundation by making it plain that France got a far better treaty than she was entitled to out of consideration for her new government.

But the procedure we follow is not only unwise; it is, further, unjust. A nation is not in fact an individual who should "do time" before it can be "paroled". We cannot have it both ways and in seeking out those we held guilty of inhuman actions we in fact admitted this obvious truth that a nation is a collection of people. It is not moral, it is highly immoral to punish those who have suffered under the Nazi regime. Take the case of Walter Eucken who died recently: an example of intellectual resistance under Nazism. After he had endured all this, he had to end his life treated as a vanquished foe! One may say that this atonement for others is highly Christian: yes, if self-chosen, but then it should not stop at the borders of Germany and we should all do penance for the sins of our erring brethren. It would indeed be a grand sight if all the rulers visited Hitler's death place to meditate on the crime of pride.

* * *

A DIRECTORATE OF DEFENSE: It is your correspondent's opinion that Germany should be admitted into the Council of Europe on equal terms and that real powers should be granted to a civilian directorate of European defense. The nations should be taxed a certain percentage of their national budgets in favor of this directorate of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defense which would dispose of these resources in favor of a European army, while national armies would be restricted to police and colonial forces. I fear the manna of American treasure falling on the several national armies, which may then touch up the regimental colors of yore. This is not common defense, but waste of money. What you want as Defense Directorate is not a clutter of generals, each imbedded in his national military tradition and a servant of his own government, but first-rate statesmen, like Churchill most obviously. Let such men build up European defense; they would build up European unity as a by-product. Let them be elected by their national constituencies. These ideas may seem of excessive simplicity. But we shall not advance towards European unity until we have decided to give a certain body of Europeans a distinct mandate and real powers to achieve its objects.

* * *

PATRIOTISM AND THE SOVIETS: A friend has just come to me, hot from reading an American commentator's remark that French patriotism provides a powerful counterfoil to Communist action, and he urges me to explain how far this view is opposed to the truth. Indeed, French popular patriotism is now the most solid weapon of the Soviets in their policy towards France and Western Union. Yes, French patriotism balked the Communists in their efforts to grip the masses until the fateful day in 1935 when Laval, visiting Stalin in Moscow, gained from him a concession which he deemed a great victory and which turned out a most fatal gift to France: the admission that the French workers should concern themselves with national defense. Within 24 hours, with miraculous dexterity, the Communist Humanité ceased insulting the army and ventured into praise of our military heroes; Joan of Arc, whose memory had heretofore been mocked, was suddenly honored as "that most glorious daughter of the people". And the Red cells vied in procession around her statue with the traditional salutes of Catholic school children.

This right-about turn was immensely effective. The Frenchman cherishes national glory and was lashed into a fury by Communist guile. He lapped up the patriotic language which was used without shame by the Communist leaders, and indeed probably with sincere relish. This was 15 years ago. During all that time the Communists have been steeped in patriotism, with the sole exception of the two years during which the Hitler-Stalin alliance was in vigor. And during that time they had little opportunity for public utterances, having been silenced first by Daladier and subsequently by the Vichy government, which turned out very much to their advantage. After the German attack on Russia they of course returned to patriotism. Thus during all but two years of a period of 15, and these two a time of silence, the French Communists have spoken the language of patriotism. All those who have risen in the Party during this period, that is, practically all those who are now active (it is a party of extremely young organizers), have heard no other language.

And my personal opinion is that this language is spoken from the heart. The Communists feel far happier, as well as immensely more successful, now that they identify themselves with the past glories of France, than they did while they derided them, a practice which only pleases a small minority of debunking intellectuals. They have established firmly in their minds that they were the main heroes of the Resistance and indeed their present political enemies complacently adopted this thesis in the years 1944 to 1946; M. Mauriac then calling upon them in the Figaro, the building of which they now stone, that as they had done most, so should they . . . and so on.

But, will you say, if the French Communists are genuine patriots, how come that they oppose the building up of national defense? I will answer with another query: do you call them bad patriots, those who served the British Government rather than the Vichy government? To the Communists today the real friend of France is Russia, and our government is aligning us in a coalition against our national interest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They use the whole vocabulary of Resistance: the government collaborates with the present imperialist power and in the true interest of France this destructive subservience is to be patriotically opposed! Will people believe that? Well, quite a number of announced patriots believed during the Occupation that the Resistance had to be hunted down; that, surely, was much harder to believe.

The Communists find themselves today in an exceedingly strong position towards the tenets of traditional popular patriotism: they oppose the Indo-China war, but so did Clemenceau. Popular patriotism has never been interested in overseas territories. The obsession of popular patriotism since 1870, when the greatest military nation of Europe was so humiliatingly defeated by Prussia single-handed, has always been Germany. Is it towards Germany that our government takes precautions? Nay, it is against Russia who "saved us" in 1914 and again in 1944. ("Aw! Forget the Americans and the British! It is thanks to the Russians that the Germans were groggy.") Thus, the Communists. And they say: "Beware, the German will come back! Who thinks of the German, the hereditary enemy? We do! Yet, tomorrow your treacherous government, true heir of Vichy, is going to rearm the Germans, spearhead of a coalition against Russia and sometime master of Europe after all! Can we call that a weak case? And is it still arguable that French patriotism is a shield against Communism? Nay, it is a handle thanks to which the Communists can turn the nation against governmental policy, and hold back the necessary inclusion of Germany in Western Europe.

Popular patriotism is an unwieldy passion. It will run steadily against an ancient foe, regardless of new dangers and new necessities. As early as the Eighteenth Century, when it was far less violent a passion, France was shaken by Choiseul's swing from the traditional alliance with Prussia to the alliance with the three-century-old foe, Austria, and many historians regard it as a major cause of the French Revolution. In our time, calling to patriotism for European federation against the Soviet threat is almost in vain. It is the Communists who can successfully appeal to patriotism. Their opponents must invoke love of individual liberty and point out that such liberty can be maintained only in a new political structure.

* * *

THE KING OF THE BELGIANS: Belgium, that exemplary country of Europe, ever quoted as a model of industriousness and liberalism, is tied up in a pretty mess. According to the principles of monarchy, Leopold is her king. This status has been put to the democratic test and he got 58 per cent of the votes; far more than did Mr. Truman in 1948, or Mr. Attlee in 1945. And the power wielded by Mr. Truman is immeasurably greater. Then a cry was started according to which a king cannot be the king of a mere majority: this was asserted for instance by an admirable English paper which upholds the memory of William of Orange. Would he in 1689 have obtained 58 per cent of the votes? One doubts it. Belgian politicians of the Socialist and Liberal parties have developed on this occasion quite remarkable theories on the limitless right of minorities. If their utterances are collected it shall be seen that the majority principle is entirely denied, an interesting departure.

The root of the matter, of course, lies deep. King Leopold's fight to regain his throne may be regarded as part of a great struggle raging all through formerly occupied countries. At the Liberation, those who had held positions of responsibility, however they had got them, had done things which those without responsibilities had not done. There were reasons to sweep them aside, often rightly and often wrongly. Thus the great openings, the great carpet-bagging era. Now in a stabler situation a comeback is staged by those who regard its success as necessary to clear their honor. And the greatest of the "comebackers" is King Leopold who is watched with the keenest interest by those in other countries who find themselves in a somewhat similar position.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED